

or no tax cut at all to arrive at that balance. That is what we call in common political parlance, and legal parlance, compromise.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KANJORSKI. It is the time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, let me state, the problem is not compromising between Republicans, even freshman Republicans and some conservative to moderate Democrats. We have the numbers to pass a balanced budget right now through this House if the administration would just get on board.

The votes last night, where not one person supported the President's budget. The vote two nights ago, where an overwhelming number of Democrats supported 7-year CBO showed that we could work together. We are willing to put everything on the table, but it has to be in the President's best interest to pass a balanced budget before he gets engaged in this.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I have to reclaim my time. If I have time, I will yield for a question. Let me say to my friend from Pennsylvania, I do not know if it is extreme polarization on the budget. Clearly, among 435 Members, we have all kinds of opinions.

Some Members do not feel that we ought to balance the budget. Some want to balance the budget their way or no way, and we have some of that. We cannot all stand completely on principle, or we would never get anything out of here. We have to compromise, and I recognize that.

The difficulty that we have on our side of the aisle is that the President whether he was campaigning in 1992, said he was not balancing the budget in 5 years. In 1993, he got up here at the State of the Union and said CBO numbers were the most reliable numbers. Now we come up with CBO 7-years and we have yet to see a plan from him that balance in 7 years, and that has caused us some confusion.

Mr. Speaker, when we see that plan, I think it is going to be easier to compare the President's vision with numbers that balance and our plan.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would say but, you realize that 5 years, 7 years, all depends what you want to do. Look, I can give you a budget today, and you can too, that balance the budget in year.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I recognize that, but I think it is key if we could get in that box of 7 years, with honestly scored numbers, then we are all talking off the same song sheet. Right now we are not there.

Ours has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office. We know what it does. If my Democrat colleagues do not like the values or what it does to peo-

ple, that is fine. But how would my friend do it within the same box?

Let me make a couple of other points. Federal employees have really, during this whole debate, been an unintended victim of this debate. Over the last several years they have seen the Federal Government downsized and many Federal employees have been losing their jobs and having to go elsewhere.

We have seen their benefits cut. We saw them cut in the last Congress. This time, there were resolutions up here to have them give up another 2½ percent of their pay to put in their retirement. We saw an effort to bring their retirement down so that their standards would not be the high 3 years, but the high 5 years. That would basically reduce their retirement.

We saw some proposals up here that would cap the Federal payment for the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan, which would mean they would be paying more for their health insurance. We saw another proposal here that would charge Federal employees for parking, even in buildings where nobody else was paying a parking fee. We were able to defeat most of those as we were moving ahead, but the unsettling thing is that working for the Federal Government is not what it used to be.

We used to say, "Give me your best and your brightest." Now it is come work for us; we will cut your benefits, we will downsize you, we will furlough you. Now they are experiencing furloughs and it is the Christmas time. Today is December 20. Many Federal employees would have received their paychecks today, but because of the shutdown in some agencies, that is not going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, the good news today, and I would like to ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD a letter to Senator JOHN WARNER, to myself, to the gentlewoman from Maryland, Mrs. MORELLA, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. WOLF, my colleague from Virginia, a letter from Speaker NEWT GINGRICH and Senate Majority Leader BOB DOLE, where they say in here that, and I will put the whole letter in the RECORD, but they basically assure Federal employees that when this is over, they will be paid retroactively.

Mr. Speaker, this has always been done before; this will be done this time. Having the House leadership on board, and the Senate leadership on board at this time, is very important.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear the news that the Federal employees are going to be paid, but they are not going to be working.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letter for the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
December 20, 1995.

Hon. JOHN WARNER,
U.S. Senate.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF
Hon. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA
Hon. TOM DAVIS

U.S. House of Representatives.
Dear Colleagues:

Because of your interest in the ongoing budget negotiations and your strong support for federal employees, we wanted to take this opportunity to reaffirm our letter of November 10, 1995, in which we made clear that employees furloughed through no fault of their own should not be punished.

It is unfortunate that President Clinton has chosen to veto appropriations bills that would have funded the salaries of federal employees at the Departments of Justice, State, Commerce, Veterans Affairs, and Housing and Urban Development, as well as independent agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency. Similarly, procedural objections by Democrats have prevented the funding of salaries at the Departments of Labor, HHS and Education.

The direct result of those actions is that furloughed federal employees at those particular agencies cannot be paid. However, we would like to reaffirm our commitment to restoring any lost wages for federal employees in a subsequent funding bill.

Thank you for your continued and strong leadership on behalf of federal workers.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House.
BOB DOLE,
Senate Majority Leader.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION IS CONGRESS' RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I was very surprised and disappointed today to learn that negotiations to get the Government operating again have been broken off. I just want to make sure that my constituents in the State of Washington know that I believe that this impasse is not justified; that it is, I believe, time for the senior Members of the House, both on the Democratic side, and the Republican side, to come together and to insist that we get a continuing resolution enacted which can only be done by this House and by this Congress.

It is not the President of the United States's fault that the Republican Congress has refused to enact a continuing resolution. They have precipitated this crisis. As we remember, Speaker GINGRICH said many months ago that he intended to do this very thing in order to try to get the President to capitulate and to accept his budget priorities which clearly are not acceptable to the American people.

□ 1730

I feel very strongly as someone who has served in this body for 19 years that we have a responsibility as Members of this institution to keep this Government running. We have veterans who may possibly not get their checks in the next few days unless we get a

continuing resolution passed. I am going to support that. If the leadership of the House brings it to the floor, we ought to vote on it and get it done. But I do not think it should stop there.

I am concerned about the people who work in the Forest Service, who work in the Park Service, who work in the Department of the Interior and the people who work at Health and Human Services, all these other agencies who are not going to be taken care of. It is very obvious that, when there is a little heat put on, the majority is willing to make some adjustments. So if the American people want this Government to operate, they are going to have to make sure that the new Members who were elected last time hear from their constituents that they want this Government reopened and started.

This is ridiculous, and then there is no justification for it. This is the worst crisis we have had in terms, I think, of the confidence of the people of this country about our Government. What the Republican majority wants is for Bill Clinton to capitulate and accept their very radical prescription for the budget. The American people do not accept the levels of cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. I think it is preposterous to have a \$254 billion tax cut when we are trying to balance the budget. That tax cut makes it incumbent upon the majority then to make these very large cuts in Medicare and Medicaid and also in education and other very sensitive and important programs to the American people.

I just hope we can bring some common sense back. I hope that the senior Members in the Democratic Party, the senior Members in the Republican Caucus can bring some sense back to this institution and do our job. We should initiate a continuing resolution to get these people back to work.

I feel sorry for the Government workers and their families who at this Christmas time are being denied their work, their opportunity to earn a living, because of this impasse.

I also urge the President to stand his ground. He should not capitulate. He should not accept this radical agenda. I am very upset about this. I am very upset and feel very badly for the people and their families who are being forced out of work because of this inability to reach an agreement.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. It becomes very obvious to me at least, maybe not others, that there are those, especially among the freshman group, after listening to one of the freshman speak earlier today, that they almost relish the Government shutting down. The Federal Government is the enemy. They want to take it down to nothing.

I can remember back when I had a conservative tell me that the Federal Government should defend our shores, deliver the mail, and get out of our

pocketbooks. In other words, that is all the Federal Government should do. That is what I am hearing here, especially among the radical ones, that they want to shut the Federal Government down. To them there is nothing wrong with it. That is what one of the freshmen said earlier today.

JUST THE TRUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, people are talking about how disappointed they are and how sad they are. Let me say what saddens me, that people can get on this floor with a straight face, with a straight face, mind you, and still spread the untruth that we are cutting Medicare. I hear that we are slashing Medicare. It is a radical agenda.

I had a member of my district call and say, please, will somebody tell me who is telling the truth up in Washington. The President keeps saying that he is shutting down the Government, and he is not going to pass the first balanced budget in a generation because you are radically cutting Medicare.

I do not want to call the President of the United States a liar, and I will not. I will let the Washington Post, the New Republic, and members of the President's own staff, former staff do this. This is the front cover of the New Republic. It says why the Democrats' demagoguery is even worse than you thought. The New Republic is one of the most liberal publications in America since 1914. It is flat out saying the President is not telling the truth.

The Washington Post writes an editorial. What saddens me, what deeply saddens me is every person that comes up and says that we are slashing Medicare is, A, either knowing that that is not true or, B, is ignorant of the facts. Ignorant of the facts that the Washington Post points out, when they say that the Democrats led by the President have chosen instead to present themselves as Medicare's great protectors, they have shamelessly used the issue, demagogued on it because they think that is where the votes are and the way to derail the Republicans.

The President was still doing it this week. A Republican proposal to increase Medicare premiums was the reason he alleged to veto and shut down the Government. But never mind the fact that the President himself would countenance the same increase. The Washington Post—this is not from NEWT GINGRICH. Wake up, America. Wake up. This is from the Washington Post, the New Republic: We are being called radical.

Do you know what is so radical about our plan, that on Medicare, we are doing the same exact thing that President Clinton and Hillary Clinton said

we needed to do 2 years ago. Hillary Clinton, shake your head, Hillary Clinton testified on Capitol Hill that we needed to slow the growth in Medicare to twice the rate of inflation. She suggested 6½ percent. The Republican plan increases it to 7 percent. Furthermore, spending on Medicare explodes to 65 percent over the next 7 years.

The press knows it. The press has stated as much. The markets have stated as much. Everybody knows the truth. Do not believe me, do not believe NEWT GINGRICH, do not believe the Democrats. Listen to what neutral observers are saying. They are trying to scare senior citizens because they are devoid of any plan to balance the budget in 7 years.

The New Republic has said it. The Washington Post has said it. The Washington Times has said it. The Wall Street Journal has said it. Editorial boards around America have said it. They said it this past week when they called Leon Panetta on the carpet on This Week with David Brinkley.

Do my colleagues know what Leon Panetta's final remark was? Well, it is just to give the rich tax cuts. Let me tell my colleagues, check it out. Eighty-nine percent of these tax cuts for the so-called rich, 89 percent as scored by CBO, goes to families earning under \$75,000. Check it out. Check out the truth.

Is \$75,000 or less for a family the way that Bill Clinton defines rich these days? If so, I think he needs to lead a Third World country instead of America, because there are a lot of people with three or four children making \$75,000 or less that have trouble getting by. If that is a tax cut for the rich, label me guilty. I am sick and tired of what is going on. I just want to hear the truth. Give me some truth.

REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL ON MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, that was quite a display we just saw, for all the fire and volume, kind of a temper tantrum really at the rostrum. I think it is very unfortunate that we are not proceeding in more of a thoughtful way reflective of the weighty issues that we have responsibility to resolve.

The gentleman hollering, describing how nothing is impacted under the Republican-passed budget regarding Medicare, in point of fact that is simply not the case. The part B premium alone, Mr. Speaker, \$46.10 a month today, in the final year of the Republican plan that will be \$88.90, compared to \$46.10.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMEROY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Would the gentleman also admit that under the